

**REMARKS**

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-11 are currently pending in the subject application. Claims 1-2 and 6-9 have been amended. Claims 1 and 8 are independent.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgement of applicants' claim for foreign priority and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document.

Applicants further appreciate the Examiner's acceptance of the drawings filed on July 10, 2003.

Claims 1-11 are presented to the Examiner for further prosecution on the merits.

**A. Introduction**

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,117,224 to Kawamura et al. ("the Kawamura et al. reference") in view of Japanese Patent No. 9,090,916 to Ito ("the Ito reference"), rejected claims 2 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view of the Ito reference and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0038371 to Yoshinaga et al. ("the Yoshinaga et al. reference"), rejected claims 3-5, 7 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view of the Ito reference and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,843,492 to Iwauchi ("the Iwauchi reference"), and rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view of the Ito reference in view of the Iwauchi reference and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,131,736 to Alvarez reference ("the Alvarez reference").

B. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1 and 8

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view of the Ito reference. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to more clearly recite the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 1 and 8 now recite, in part, that, during non-display periods, the driver drives the LCD panel “to display white light.” This is clearly set forth throughout the specification, and shown by the frames illustrated in FIGS. 4 and 5.

While the Kawamura et al. reference may disclose an LCD including an LCD panel and a driver that interposes non-display periods, the only example of such a non-display period is a blanking period, which means the display is at black level. Therefore, as noted by the Examiner, the Kawamura et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest a non-display period during which a white signal is displayed.

The Examiner then relies on the Ito reference as teaching such use of a white signal. However, it is respectfully submitted that such use is not disclosed or suggested by the Ito reference. In particular, while the Ito reference may disclose the use of a white signal, such use is within a display period and is used in serial image formation. As can be seen in FIG. 3-5 of the Ito reference, the white signal W is in between the green signal G and the red signal R. Thus, the white signal W is clearly part of the display period, or full color display will not be realized, as the red signal would be outside the display period as well. As can be seen by comparing FIG. 5, showing the proposed solution in the Ito reference to FIG. 11, showing the problem to be solved by the Ito reference, i.e., color bleed or offset due to the serial nature of the display in the Ito reference.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Ito reference fails to disclose or suggest a white period in a non-display period, as recited in the present invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither the Kawamura et al. reference nor the Ito reference, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in claims 1 or 8. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

C. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 2 and 9

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura reference in view of the Ito reference and further in view of the Yoshinaga et al. reference. Claims 2 and 9 depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively. The Yoshinaga et al. reference fails to provide the teaching noted above as missing from the initial combination. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 9 are allowable for at least the reasons their respective base claims are allowable. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

D. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 3-5, 7 and 10-11

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-5, 7 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view of the Ito reference and further in view of the Iwauchi reference. Claims 3-5, 7 and 10-11 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 8, respectively. The Iwauchi reference fails to provide the teaching noted above as missing from the initial combination. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-5, 7 and 10-11 are allowable for at least the reasons their respective base claims are allowable. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

E. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claim 6

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kawamura et al. reference in view of the Ito reference in view of the Iwauchi reference and further in view of the Alvarez reference. Claim 6 depends from claim 5. The Alvarez reference fails to provide the teaching noted above as missing from the initial combination. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is allowable for at least the reasons its respective base claim is allowable. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

E. Conclusion

Since the cited prior art references neither anticipates nor renders obvious the subject invention as presently claimed, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-11 are now in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

The remaining documents cited by the Examiner were not relied on to reject the claims. Therefore, no comments concerning these documents are believed necessary at this time.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this application is earnestly solicited, and an early and favorable further action upon all the claims is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE & MORSE, P.C.

Date: December 28, 2005

  
Eugene M. Lee, Reg. No. 32,039

**LEE & MORSE, P.C.**  
1101 WILSON BOULEVARD, SUITE 2000  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209  
703.525.0978 TEL  
703.525.4265 FAX

PETITION and  
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT CHARGE AUTHORIZATION

This document and any concurrently filed papers are believed to be timely. Should any extension of the term be required, applicant hereby petitions the Director for such extension and requests that any applicable petition fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

If fee payment is enclosed, this amount is believed to be correct. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

Any additional fee(s) necessary to effect the proper and timely filing of the accompanying-papers may also be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.